

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

GLOBAL NUCLEAR ENERGY PARTNERSHIP (GNEP)
PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETINGS

OAK RIDGE, TENNESSEE

FEBRUARY 13, 2007

1	COMMENTATORS	
2		PAGE
3	JOE LENHARD	6
4	JOHN CHAMBLISS - ITRC Board of Advisors	7
5	JIM CAMPBELL - ETEC	9
6	HOMER FISHER - ETEC	11
7	WOLF NAEGELI - Fdtn for Global Sustainability	14
8	FRANK HENSLEY (Written Comments Attached TCWP)	15
9	FRANCES LAMBERTS	17
10	BILL JOHNSTON (Written Comments Attached AFORR)	19
11	GARRY WHITLEY - ATLC	20
12	ERICH EVERED	21
13	ALICE MURPHY - ETEBA	23
14	SARAH SMITH	25
15	DAVID MOSBY	28
16	BARBARA A. WALTON - CAP/LOC	30
17	MILES SMITH	34
18	ELIZABETH DIXON (Written Comments Attached)	36
19	BETH LEWIS	38
20	ROBERT PEELLE (Written Comments Attached)	41
21	FRANZ RAETZER	44
22	GERRY MULL	45
23	ROBERT G. KENNEDY	45
24		
25		

1 INTRODUCTION

2 MR. HOLMES BROWN

3 Good evening. Welcome to this Public Scoping
4 Meeting on the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement
5 (PEIS) for the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership (GNEP).
6 The development of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)
7 for this project by the Department of Energy's Office of
8 Nuclear Energy is required by the National Environmental
9 Policy Act (NEPA).

10 My name is Holmes Brown, and I will serve as the
11 facilitator for this event. My role is to ensure that this
12 meeting runs on schedule and that everyone has an
13 opportunity to speak. I am not an employee of DOE nor an
14 advocate for any party or position.

15 At the registration table, you should have received
16 a Participant's Packet. If not, please raise your hand so
17 staff can bring it to you. It contains important
18 information on the presentation and is a convenient place to
19 take notes during the briefing that will follow in a few
20 minutes.

21 There are three purposes for tonight's meeting:

22 First, to provide information on the content of the
23 proposed Programmatic Impact Statement (PEIS) and on the
24 National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) which governs the
25 process.

1 Second, to answer your questions on the proposed
2 PEIS and NEPA, and;

3 Third, to receive and record your formal comments
4 on the scope of the proposed PEIS.

5 The agenda for tonight's meeting reflects these
6 purposes. We will begin with our introductory remarks by
7 video from Mr. Dennis Spurgeon, DOE Assistant Secretary for
8 Nuclear Energy.

9 That will be followed by a presentation from Mr.
10 Richard Black regarding the proposed Programmatic
11 Environmental Impact Statement for GNEP. Mr. Black is the
12 Associate Deputy Assistant Secretary, Office of Nuclear
13 Energy.

14 To answer your questions, project staff will be
15 available throughout the evening at the display tables.
16 They can discuss the proposed PEIS and the NEPA process, the
17 contents of the printed materials on display, and the
18 contents of Mr. Black's presentation.

19 Following Mr. Black's presentation, we will recess
20 so that the public may pursue further questions with
21 available project staff.

22 Once we reconvene, the court reporter will be
23 available to receive your comments and suggestions regarding
24 the scope of the GNEP and PEIS. All your comments will be
25 transcribed and made part of the permanent record.

FORMAL COMMENT PERIOD

Let me review a few ground rules for the formal comments first.

If you have a written version of your statement, please provide the written copies to the court reporter after you have completed your remarks. Also, please include any additional attachments to your remarks to be included in the official transcript. These will be labeled and submitted for inclusion in the formal record.

In view of the number of people that have indicated an interest in speaking this evening, please confine your public statements to five -- I'm sorry, three minutes; and if it's longer, I'll let you know when you have a minute left.

5 So with that by way of introduction, let me call
6 our first speaker and the second one. Joe Lenhard is our
7 first person signed up to speak and John Chambliss will
8 follow.

10 MR. JOE LENHARD: Thank you. Welcome to all of
11 you, particularly all of you who are not from Oak Ridge.
12 We're happy to have you here today. My name is Joe Lenhard.
13 I came to Oak Ridge exactly 50 years ago from Graduate
14 School at Vanderbilt University. I've been here ever since,
15 never left, this is my home. I love it.

19 I'm really excited and pleased with what GNEP is
20 offering to the United States, and we need to get behind it
21 and support it. One thing the United States needs to be
22 doing is rapidly expanding our nuclear energy production in
23 this nation.

1 source in this nation.

2 Now GNEP is going to make it easier to do that,
3 it's going to make it safer because we won't have plutonium
4 being handled around the country. We will not be making
5 long-term waste. The waste will be short term. And it's
6 just absolutely great for the nation to do it that way.

7 As a matter of fact, we should have -- as you noted
8 up here, nuclear energy kind of started 30 years ago. We
9 should have 30 years ago done what GNEP is proposing to do
10 now. All the other nations that are big nuclear users did
11 it 20 or 30 years ago. So that's very important.

12 So I urge all of you to support GNEP and let's get
13 behind it and make it happen as soon as we can. Also, I was
14 told, when I was preparing for this, we had only one minute.
15 So I'm about done.

16 I would like to note in closing that since Oak
17 Ridge invented the operation of nuclear power plants and the
18 reprocessing of fuel and the recycling, that there is a
19 great deal we here in Oak Ridge can do to make the GNEP
20 program successful.

21 Thank you.

22 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Joe set a good precedent.

23 John Chambliss is next. John will be followed by
24 Jim Campbell.

25 MR. JOHN CHAMBLISS: My name is John Chambliss.

1 I'm from Chattanooga, Tennessee. I sit on the Board of
2 Advisors of the Interstate Technology Regulatory Council.
3 We clean up toxic waste; write new texts, new books on how
4 to clean up toxic waste better; and we have 46 states that
5 are members of this organization. I represent everybody in
6 this nation that is not a regulator. That means people like
7 you-all.

8 I have no science background. I live in
9 Chattanooga. It's downstream from Oak Ridge. I am
10 committed towards this concept and idea. I think we have
11 the best nation doing it. It needs to be done not only for
12 our use but others. We can take care of the stimulation
13 here in Oak Ridge.

14 But I want to read a couple of things, nothing
15 scientific. I would like to start and have you-all think of
16 the worst possible toxic waste site that might happen.

17 "I met a traveler from an antique
18 land Who said: Two vast and trunkless
19 legs of stone stand in the desert. Near
20 them, on the sand, half sunk, a shattered
21 visage lies, whose frown and wrinkled lip,
22 and sneer of cold command, tell that its
23 sculpture well those passions read which
24 yet survive, stamped on these lifeless
25 things, the hand that mocked them, and the
heart that fed: And on the pedestal these
words appear: 'My name is Ozymandias,
King of Kings: Look on my works, ye
Mighty, and despair!' Nothing beside
remains. Round the decay of that colossal
wreck, boundless and bare the lone and
level sands stretch far away."

1 That is written by Shelly about 1815. Osymandias
2 did exist.

3 This is an answer to that. What we're doing here
4 is taking energy, using it again, and recycling it so that
5 we're not going to have issues.

6 Now, in closing, I'm going to do something sort of
7 strange for this organization. It comes from Genesis 2:15:
8 "And God placed man in the garden to dress it and care for
9 it." It is time.

10 Thank you.

11 MR. BROWN: Jim Campbell and Homer Fisher will
12 follow.

13 MR. JIM CAMPBELL: My name is Jim Campbell. I'm
14 the President of the East Tennessee Economic Council, and
15 after those two talks I'm not sure there's anything left to
16 say. I don't have a poem or scripture. And I have only
17 lived in Oak Ridge 25 years, so I'm not near the resident
18 that Joe is, but we're going to work on that.

19 I want to thank the Department of Energy and folks
20 that are running this EIS for allowing the public comments
21 today.

22 Clearly our nation needs to explore every option to
23 provide cost-effective clean reliable safe energy
24 production. Couple that with our need for energy security
25 at the SALT complex and environmental problems and to reduce

1 the risk of nuclear proliferation, you have an immense
2 challenge for our nation. I'm glad that DOE and Doc
3 Spurgeon are taking that on right now.

4 GNEP begins to address each of those issues in a
5 comprehensive way and we appreciate the time and effort that
6 are going into preparing this comprehensive Programmatic
7 Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS). Clearly much work
8 needs to be done. Part of that work is improving the
9 science and technology base. And as I look around this room
10 today, there's a number of people that will be a part of
11 that effort.

12 Another issue that must be addressed is providing
13 a work force for the future. Most of the folks in this room
14 are older, as well, and we need to have a new generation of
15 folks working on these kinds of energy challenges.

16 You need to do a better job of communicating the
17 risks and the benefits of nuclear power so that we have
18 better informed public policy on this.

19 The last thing I want to say tonight is part of the
20 challenge that the Department of Energy is going to have in
21 accomplishing a mission of such grand scope is something
22 that we've learned a little bit about here in Oak Ridge over
23 the past few years with the completion of the spallation
24 neutron source and now our newest job of managing the Erie
25 Project for the U.S. Government.

1 Any kind of mega project that is over billions of
2 dollars is going to take an excellent team both of
3 government officials, private contractors, and local
4 communities that come together to achieve the outcome. And
5 I think that needs to be considered strongly as we develop
6 this program and work.

7 Thank you for your time.

8 MR. BROWN: Homer Fisher will be followed by Wolfe
9 Naegeli.

10 MR. HOMER FISHER: I'm Homer Fisher. I'm retired
11 from the University of Tennessee and I serve on the boards
12 of the East Tennessee Economic Council and the Oak Ridge
13 Chamber of Commerce. I have been a resident of East
14 Tennessee for 30 years now; living in Anderson County here
15 for the last 15. It is a pleasure to be a part of this
16 community and to observe the strong partnership that has
17 existed between Oak Ridge and the Department of Energy.
18 We thank the Department of Energy for giving us an
19 opportunity to speak on this topic tonight.

20 I think GNEP is one of the most important and
21 significant undertakings ever put forward by the Department
22 of Energy and I applaud the thinking that has gone behind
23 this very bold proposal.

24 I really believe that all forms of energy should be
25 explored and DOE has a track record of funding opportunities

1 in a variety of energy areas from wind to solar to hydrogen
2 to the fossil fuel refinement and to the fissile fuels.
3 They've done a good job in supporting that.

4 But it's clear to the Department of Energy, it's
5 clear to many of our nation's leaders, and it's clear to
6 people who have studied the issue, that nuclear power offers
7 the only viable way to meet the long-term energy
8 requirements of this country and the world. It's the only
9 way we can reduce the dependence on foreign oil and it's the
10 only way that we'll be able to fully reduce the production
11 of carbon emissions and compete economically with other
12 nations that have far stronger energy productions programs
13 using nuclear energy.

14 We're not in a competitive position now with the
15 high cost of fossil fuel and all of the surrounding
16 associated costs.

17 GNEP is a comprehensive way to deal with the issue
18 of addressing nuclear power. It provides a safe and secure
19 approach to moving this country and other countries forward
20 together in providing widespread and safe use of nuclear
21 power.

22 I won't go over the rationale presented very
23 effectively in the presentation that we received earlier,
24 but I do want to point out that the global energy demand
25 that's expected to rise by 60 percent over the next 25 or so

1 years and, as we heard earlier today, to double in the
2 united States by 2030.

3 Also, global warming is now recognized as the
4 nations most serious health problem by the National Center
5 for Environmental Health. And more and more people are
6 realizing the relationship between use of fossil fuel and
7 very serious illnesses related to lungs and heart.

8 James Lovelock who is a noted British scientist,
9 who also is an environmentalist and futurologist, has said
10 recently that he is agreeing and he encourages his friends
11 in the movement to drop their objections to nuclear energy
12 and to embrace it, noting that every year that we continue
13 burning coal it makes it worse for our descendents. And the
14 only immediately available source that does not cause global
15 warming is nuclear energy.

16 I believe that GNEP offers the pathway to using
17 nuclear energy safely, securely, and with significant
18 international cooperation. And as the Department of Energy
19 moves forward, I hope that it will take into consideration
20 the proud heritage in energy related research here in Oak
21 Ridge, our nuclear history, and the capabilities this
22 community can bring forward to insure that GNEP is a
23 success.

24 Again, we appreciate the opportunity to be here
25 tonight. And I'll tell you how much it means to me. At

1 7:00 o'clock tonight the tipoff game between the University
2 of Kentucky and Tennessee took place over at Thompson
3 Bowling Arena, and I'm here and not there.

4 MR. BROWN: We were warned not to mention that,
5 but the cat's out of the bag.

6 MR. WOLF NAEGELI: Good evening. My name is Wolfe
7 Naegeli. I'm a board member for the Foundation for Global
8 Sustainability. I commend DOE on holding this scoping
9 meeting, but we deplore that there is no reasonable
10 alternative offered.

11 The idea of -- what we really need is a soft energy
12 future alternative from serious thoughts on how we can
13 reduce our energy dependence in less dangerous ways.

14 The idea of reenforcing nuclear nonproliferation
15 policies through massive expansion of nuclear energy
16 industries is a pipe dream. In the eyes of many other
17 nations and people, this plan amounts to nothing less than
18 another attempt by the United States to bully them around.
19 It will generate resentment. And we now hear every day on
20 the news where that leads us.

21 I have no doubt that it is possible to build safer
22 -- an inherently safer nuclear power plant, at least safer
23 than we have now. But as the saying goes: "No one is more
24 foolish than he who believes he can build a full proof
25 device." The risks may be small but potential consequences

1 would be truly calamitous. And we're not just talking about
2 carelessness or outright stupidity here. We have to contend
3 with devious, malicious ingenuity.

4 It is quite common for our existing nuclear power
5 plants to fail security checks even when they know at what
6 time to expect a mock attack. GNEP would build a number of
7 high-yield targets for terrorists. Instead of wasting
8 billions of dollars on GNEP, we should do more research to
9 develop all the potential that still exists on energy
10 efficiency and on more soft energy alternatives. Bionergy
11 offers a lot of possibilities and it doesn't create these
12 huge plants that are so attractive to terrorists.

13 Thank you.

14 MR. BROWN: Thank you very much. Francis Lamberts
15 will follow Frank.

16 MR. FRANK HENSLEY: My name is Frank Hensley and I
17 represent the Tennessee Citizens for Wilderness Planning,
18 better known as TCWP. TCWP appreciates the opportunity to
19 comment on the scope of the Programmatic Environmental
20 Impact Statement being prepared for the Global Nuclear
21 Energy Partnership facilities. We are a 40-year-old Oak
22 Ridge based conservation organization that is active in
23 local, state, and federal issues.

24 The Global Nuclear Energy Partnership facilities
25 are very important projects. If Oak Ridge is chosen for the

1 Nuclear Fuel Recycling Center (NFRC) and/or the Advanced
2 Recycling Reactor (ARR), we strongly recommend that
3 brownfields be used for their location.

4 The most suitable brownfield for these facilities
5 is the 5,000-acre East Tennessee Technology Park better
6 known as K-25. This brownfield site has the infrastructure,
7 has an operating rail line, has river transportation
8 facilities, and has ready access to Interstate 40.

9 Hundreds of millions of taxpayers' dollars are
10 being spent to decontaminate and prepare this site for
11 industrial use. Reindustrialization of K-25 is a major goal
12 of the Community Reuse Organization of East Tennessee
13 (CROET). Therefore, locating the Nuclear Fuel Recycling
14 Center and the Advance Recycle Reactor at K-25 would
15 accomplish this goal. It is very disturbing that K-25 was
16 not considered for the location of these two facilities.

17 Approximately 20,000 acres of relatively
18 undisturbed land remains of the original 58,000-acre Oak
19 Ridge Reservation. We do not understand why DOE has funded
20 Community Reuse Organization of East Tennessee to study
21 4,000 to 7,000 acres of this undisturbed forested land for
22 the location of these proposed facilities. This forrest is
23 an irreplaceable asset for future climate and biological
24 research, for education, recreation, and wildlife habitat.

25 Developing the proposed facilities on these

1 undisturbed Oak Ridge Reservation greenfields would have a
2 major environmental impact and would require a
3 Reservation-wide Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

4 We request that DOE study the K-25 site for these
5 two proposed facilities and that a Reservation-wide EIS be
6 completed before any greenfields are considered for location
7 of these facilities.

8 Thank you.

9 MR. BROWN: Frances Lamberts. And Bill Johnston
10 will next.

11 MS. FRANCES LAMBERTS: I'm Frances Lamberts and I
12 am just a concerned citizen with several concerns about
13 GNEP.

14 First of all, I also want to thank DOE for holding
15 this meeting and allowing citizen input to this proposal. I
16 look forward very much to seeing this program. Some of my
17 concerns relate (a) something I didn't quite notice that
18 wasn't mentioned at all in the presentation, and that
19 relates to nuclear terrorism.

20 The New York Times in November of 2001, I think,
21 raised this question and suggested the alarming verdict by
22 nuclear weapons experts who had looked at this issue of
23 whether terrorist -- international terrorist groups could
24 make nuclear bombs. And these nuclear weapons experts had
25 come to the alarming conclusion that if two or three

1 specialists in their ranks and with a machine shop very
2 likely could. The only problem is they don't have easy
3 access to plutonium or the highly enriched uranium.

4 Now several analyses or suggestions that I've seen
5 indicate that the reprocessing process of the plutonium
6 would be much more easily -- can be much more easily handled
7 and is much more vulnerable to theft than it is now. So
8 that would be a concern and I would hope that the DPEIS
9 would look at this question comprehensively and objectively,
10 and look at this.

11 Second concern is that several analysts and someone
12 at the Intertrip Scientists and I believe even a NASA
13 Academy of Scientist study have indicated that to provide
14 the fuel to run our nuclear power plants, the economics are
15 such that to use reprocessed plutonium would be much, much
16 more costly -- by a factor of I don't know how much -- than
17 to start with uranium. So inasmuch as a very large part of
18 this money is the peoples' money, I would also, in terms of
19 the scope of the environmental impact study, hope that this
20 would be looked at; the different cost scenarios would be
21 looked at comprehensively, especially since I think that
22 like myself many of these people whose money would be
23 funding this are not necessarily the ones who are clamoring
24 for expansion of the nuclear energy future.

25 Thank you.

1 MR. BROWN: Mr. Johnston and Garry Whitley will
2 follow.

3 MR. BILL JOHNSTON: Good evening. I'm Bill
4 Johnston. I'm a citizen of the City of Oak Ridge. I'm
5 providing these comments on behalf of Advocates For the Oak
6 Ridge Reservation, also known as AFORR.

7 AFORR is a local nonprofit organization formed in
8 1999 with the purpose of supporting the continued existence
9 of the Oak Ridge Reservation for multiple values and uses
10 such as science and technology, conservation, public safety,
11 education, and recreations. AFORR supports DOE's nuclear
12 technology mission. AFORR can support GNEP in Oak Ridge if
13 environmental considerations are made.

14 AFORR believes that consideration of the Oak Ridge
15 Reservation as a candidate location for GNEP should be
16 limited to previously disturbed sites. One is the available
17 brownfield sites is the former K-25 site which is being
18 decontaminated and decommissioned to prepare it for future
19 uses.

20 Another is the site on the TVA, Tennessee Valley
21 Authority, land that was cleared and excavated for the
22 Clinch River Breeder Reactor. That land has been vacant
23 ever since that project was cancelled in the 1980s.
24 Ironically, the Clinch River Breeder Reactor project was the
25 last federal effort to demonstrate a commercial breeder

1 reactor. Wouldn't it be interesting to put GNEP facilities
2 on this site.

3 Both of these sites should be suitable for GNEP's
4 facilities and should be considered in the PEIS. The
5 availability of these previously disturbed sites, which are
6 far more topographically suitable for large industrial
7 facilities than any of the undeveloped greenfield areas on
8 the western Oak Ridge Reservation, should preclude the
9 consideration of greenfield sites on the Reservation that
10 has substantial value in their natural state and for ongoing
11 DOE uses.

12 It is unfortunate that there has been no site-wide
13 environmental impact statement for the Oak Ridge Reservation
14 to provide support for land-use allocation decisions such as
15 this one. AFORR has sought a site-wide EIS for several
16 years, and we continue to hope that DOE will acknowledge and
17 fulfill its legal obligation to prepare a site-wide EIS.

18 Thank you.

19 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Garry Whitley and Erich
20 Evered will follow.

21 MR. GARRY WHITLEY: Good afternoon. Before I tell
22 you my name, I'm an optimist. So it's 20 to 2, Tennessee.

23 I'm Garry Whitley. I'm here representing the
24 Atomic Trade and Labor Council of Oak Ridge. I'm the
25 president. We represent the labor force of Y-12 and ORNL

1 National Laboratories. The Atomic Trade and Labor Council
2 is 2100 members, comprised of a highly-skilled labor
3 workforce. Its combination of skills and experience working
4 with nuclear materials is unduplicated anywhere in the
5 United States. The men and women of the Atomic Trade and
6 Labor Council believe that we must start today answering the
7 energy problems of tomorrow. We can't wait ten or fifteen
8 years.

9 Oak Ridge has played an important role in solving
10 these problems for the nation for 60 years and the Atomic
11 Trade and Labor Council have been a part of that for all the
12 60 years. We believe that it will help make the world safer
13 and the nation stronger by focusing on a long-term supply of
14 clean energy that does not increase the presence of
15 heat-trapped gasses in the atmosphere and at the same time
16 will reduce the threat of proliferation of special nuclear
17 materials.

18 The men and women of the Atomic Trade and Labor
19 Council support the GNEP strategy and stand ready to make it
20 a reality. And there's nowhere better to put it than at Oak
21 Ridge, Tennessee.

22 Thank you.

23 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Erich Evered will be
24 followed by Alice Murphy.

25 MR. ERICH EVERED: My name is Erich Evered and I am

1 not a nuke. And I am fully supportive of the GNEP
2 objectives and the prospect of locating one or more of its
3 facilities in Oak Ridge.

4 As a geologist and engineer I've spent half of my
5 33-year career in the nonnuclear energy production industry
6 and the other half in the environmental clean-up and waste
7 management industry in which I currently work. I also spent
8 four years as an administrator of the Energy Information
9 Administration at DOE Headquarters, a federal agency
10 responsible for the collection and analysis of data on all
11 aspects of energy supply, consumption, and forecasting the
12 future needs.

13 All of this has given me a very thorough
14 understanding of the importance of expanded nuclear baseload
15 power generation and closing the nuclear fuel cycle to
16 meeting our country's energy needs of the future and
17 minimizing insult to the environment.

18 I've lived a lot of wonderful places in this
19 outstanding country and we are in Oak Ridge by choice for
20 purposes of the quality of life in this community. I have
21 an 8-year-old son that I am looking forward to continuing to
22 raise in Oak Ridge. And I can think of no better gift to
23 give him than the continued leadership role for Oak Ridge in
24 the nuclear industry, including power generation and closing
25 the fuel cycle under the initiatives of GNEP.

1 Thank you.

2 MR. BROWN: Alice Murphy. Sarah Smith will follow
3 Alice.

4 MS. ALICE MURPHY: Good evening. My name is Alice
5 Murphy. I am the Executive Director for ETEBA. That stands
6 for the Energy Technology and Environmental Business
7 Association. We have about a 150 business organizations in
8 our organization, and those are both large and small,
9 representing businesses primarily from the Oak Ridge area
10 but we also have businesses from across the United States.
11 A lot of those businesses have expertise in nuclear energy.

12 ETEBA supports the Alternative Two GNEP preferred
13 alternative because we believe that it has several benefits:
14 It provides cost-effective reliable energy production. As
15 was mentioned earlier, worldwide energy demands are going to
16 double in about the next 15 years. That's an astronomical
17 thing to think about; doubling the energy needs by 2030.
18 The U.S. demands will increase by 65%.

19 As a former manager for the Department of Energy --
20 I've got 30 years with the Department of Energy -- one of
21 the jobs that I had was the deputy manager for one of the
22 DOE's fossil energy laboratory which is located in
23 Morgantown and Pittsburgh. That laboratory does research on
24 how much energy supply we have with coal, gas, and oil.
25 Some of the projections show that we have about a 100 years,

1 some say that we have 200 years. So when you think about
2 it, that's not a long time.
3 With this energy growth doubling every 15 or 20 years, we
4 are going to need a lot more energy, and nuclear energy is
5 that source.

6 Unlike fossil energy, there's a limited supply of
7 nuclear energy production. This will decrease our
8 independence -- will decrease our dependence on foreign oil.
9 But we have to start today, if we want to secure our energy
10 independence. The GNEP will improve the environment for the
11 world. It's carbon free, it does not emit greenhouse
12 gasses, and 93.6% of the uranium in spent nuclear fuel can
13 be recoverable through the reprocessing facilities. It also
14 reduces the risk of nuclear proliferation. Nuclear
15 production capability is increasing worldwide. Countries
16 will build nuclear power plants. The question is: How to
17 prevent nuclear proliferation; how do we prevent the
18 technology from following into the wrong hands?

19 Under the GNEP project the U.S. will work with
20 other advanced nuclear nations to develop a fuel services
21 program that will provide nuclear fuel and recycling
22 services to nations in return for their commitment to
23 refrain from developing enrichment and recycling technology.
24 The technology base exists for GNEP. The sodium fast
25 reactor has already been proven. France, UK, Japan, and

1 Russia already have reprocessing facilities.

2 Lastly, I would like to say that we believe that
3 Oak Ridge has excellent potential for a possible GNEP
4 facility. It has been the leader in spent-fuel actually
5 processing R&D for 60 years. The facilities here at Oak
6 Ridge represent a five billion dollar strategic nuclear
7 energy asset. We have the design, expertise, construction,
8 and operation of large scale nuclear fuel reprocessing
9 equipment.

10 So in summary, ETEBA supports the GNEP as a path to
11 providing the U.S. with energy security and preventing
12 further nuclear proliferation in countries who might wish to
13 terrorize others.

14 Thank you.

15 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Sarah Smith. And she will
16 be followed by David Mosby.

17 MS. SARAH SMITH: Thank you. My name is Sarah
18 Smith and I'm one of your neighbors down the road,
19 Interstate 40, around the Carthage area. We mighty pleased
20 to be up here. We have more knowledge in this room than in
21 anything I've been in a long time and I really appreciate
22 and understand all that.

23 I certainly understand Oak Ridge and your love for
24 Oak Ridge, because this is how Oak Ridge was built and this
25 is where your jobs come. I remember as small child coming

1 here with my father who was physicist teacher and going to
2 the museum and getting my little bottle of radiated material
3 and thinking that was the coolest thing in the world. Of
4 course, no telling what I got from it later on. But that
5 was a big thing in the museum.

6 I also see this from a point of view where -- I do
7 live near Carthage, Tennessee. And in the 70s the largest
8 nuclear plant in the world was supposed to be built there.
9 It got almost built but it was stopped. A few years ago
10 they wanted to put a uranium enrichment plant there, also
11 called EURECO, from Europe. A multi-million dollar company
12 came there. They didn't build it there and went on to New
13 Mexico.

14 I guess I'm seeing this from a little different
15 perspective because -- whereas I understand this is very
16 important to all of you here for your jobs, I guess in the
17 best of all worlds I would wish all of the great brains and
18 talent here could be redirected to true renewable energy and
19 we use all this wonderful power for wind/solar.

20 I also wish all the billions and billions of
21 dollars that have been directed to nuclear over the years
22 could be matched dollar-for-dollar for some of these
23 renewables. If we are going to subsidize, we should do it
24 evenly across the board; and this is the comment I have to
25 the Department of Energy. If we're going to subsidize and

1 we're going to use our tax dollars, let's do it evenly
2 across the board so it is a fair playing field. It is truly
3 a market economy where no one is being giving more than
4 others.

5 And, again, I truly understand, I truly appreciate
6 all of the knowledge and all of the hard work and that this
7 is what your home is built on here. If it was an isolated
8 island and there weren't neighbors around and if there
9 weren't "boo-boos" that can happen, as I used to say when I
10 was a kid -- I mean, look at this. This is technology.
11 (Pointing to the microphone) But it doesn't totally work,
12 does it?

13 But the place wherever they're going to put that
14 great, largest nuclear plant in the world and nuclear
15 enrichment plant. Guess what? If we had a catastrophe or
16 either of these dams in the area break, the whole area would
17 be flooded. So sometimes we just don't plan ahead. Thank
18 goodness we didn't have either one of those built there and
19 hopefully we won't have a flood.

20 But I just wish we could all think through this
21 together. We're all in this together. We're all in this
22 world together. DOE, TVA, Oak Ridge, little Carthage is
23 down the road -- we need to rethink some of the things we're
24 doing. Again, you've got more knowledge in this room than I
25 could hope to see in another room for the rest of my life.

1 Can't we put this knowledge together and come up with
2 something across the board, across the board that gives
3 everybody an opportunity?

4 We've got some great resources out there, and some
5 of it is wind and solar. I just don't think the DOE is
6 giving a sufficient amount of money and time to that. We
7 can all work together in this. I think there's a better
8 way. We can all work at it together. I would challenge us
9 to do that.

10 Thank you.

11 MR. BROWN: Thank you. David Mosby followed by
12 Barbara Walton

13 MR. DAVID MOSBY: Thank you. And I would like to
14 thank the Department for allowing this opportunity to
15 provide comment on this very, very important proposal.

16 My name is David Mosby and I'm a member of the Oak
17 Ridge City Council. I'm here today to represent that
18 Council because on September the 5th the Oak Ridge City
19 Council considered a resolution to support the GNEP process.
20 And we have a resolution that we adopted on that date and
21 I'm going to make it a part of the written record. But
22 today I wanted to give you just an excerpt of part of the
23 resolution, verbally.

24 And it goes something like this:

25 "Whereas in publishing its criteria for site

1 selection, DOE has listed Oak Ridge as one of the
2 competitive sites;

3 "And whereas Oak Ridge has a long and proud
4 heritage of hosting DOE facilities that advance nuclear
5 science and technology, and for more than 60 years has been
6 at the forefront of research and development in the fields
7 of nuclear energy and medicine;

8 "And whereas Oak Ridge could play a significant
9 role in meeting GNEP's objective, which include enhancing
10 national security and addressing the growth demand for
11 energy through the accelerated development of nuclear and
12 deployment of advanced nuclear technologies;

13 "And whereas the City of Oak Ridge has long been on
14 record as a supporter of nuclear power;

15 "And whereas the GNEP concept offers a strategy to
16 expand production of clean safe nuclear power while reducing
17 the threat of proliferation;

18 "Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Council of
19 the City of Oak Ridge, Tennessee, that the City of Oak Ridge
20 endorses and supports the U.S. Department of Energy's Global
21 Nuclear Energy Partnership and its approach to development
22 of worldwide consensus on enabling expanded use of
23 economical carbon free nuclear energy to meet the growing
24 electricity demand.

25 "Be it further resolved, the Oak Ridge City Council

1 supports the consideration of Oak Ridge as a suitable site
2 for location of the facilities required to accomplish GNEP's
3 objective and advocates strongly the performance of a
4 detailed study of potential sites on the Oak Ridge
5 Reservation."

6 The rest of the resolution I'm going to submit in
7 written form, but I am just happy to have the opportunity to
8 present a portion of that to you today.

9 Thank you.

10 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Next is Barbara Walton.
11 She will be followed by Miles Smith.

12 MS. BARBARA WALTON: I'm Barbara Walton. I'm a
13 resident of Oak Ridge and I am a member of the Citizens
14 Advisory Panel of the Local Oversight Committee (CAP/LOC),
15 who is meeting this evening. I am not attending that
16 meeting so that I can attend this meeting. I am speaking as
17 an individual, but I will be reporting back to them; and
18 they will be sending a letter, officially, either from CAP
19 or the Board. I'm not sure how that will work out.

20 I commend the goals of the GNEP program, especially
21 the fuel services program. That should be a help in
22 nonproliferation efforts, the reactor program, because
23 certainly there are reactors that are more resistant to the
24 proliferation problem.

25 My comments tonight focus on what should be in the

1 Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement so that we
2 can analyze various alternatives and come up with good
3 decisions.

4 And since we are talking about a program that is
5 international in scope and nuclear energy is supplied by
6 commercial firms by and large throughout the world, it is
7 very important to add to the list that was in the
8 announcement of opportunity, issues to be addressed, that
9 the evaluation of long-term cost effectiveness of the
10 various technologies under consideration; because they must
11 be commercially viable in order to really succeed in a
12 global economy.

13 Also, I spent about 20 years working on the
14 national weather and climate program as an employee of NASA
15 and I moved to Oak Ridge upon retiring. I've always been
16 interested in the nuclear energy aspects. Penn State had a
17 nuclear reactor when I went there and I found out more
18 recently that there was an Oak Ridge connection for that.

19 But I must remind you that as we get into this
20 global warming there are going to be unpredictables such as
21 the availability of water which all reactors need for
22 cooling purposes. And that is not as predictable as
23 rainfall patters; those scenarios. We know that patterns of
24 rainfall are going to change but we don't know how they're
25 going to change. It's very difficult to predict. We can

1 predict a temperature rise but you can't predict how it's
2 going to, you know, play out locally.

3 So the water resources that are going to be needed
4 for the expansion of the nuclear energy should be addressed
5 in that Environmental Impact Statement also.

6 One of those goals of an Environmental Impact
7 Statement that is programmatic in scope would be to
8 distinguish what are pipe dreams and what are reality. I
9 think using a sodium-cooled fast reactor as a baseline is an
10 excellent thing because that is a known technology, but
11 there are other new reactor technologies. I remember a
12 couple of years ago reviewing a summary of them and some of
13 them are very interesting; some of them even use natural
14 uranium rather than enriched uranium, which lends itself to
15 nonproliferation aspects too.

16 Now, we also need to be careful because, of course,
17 they did have the West Valley Demonstration Project and
18 they're still trying to clear-up the remains for that.
19 That's the only one that I'm aware of. And I don't know how
20 the foreign governments are handling waste from their
21 recycled spent nuclear fuel.

22 But I do want to add a word of caution, because the
23 spent nuclear fuel standard for ensuring that plutonium is
24 detectable. So for our excess weapons grade plutonium, the
25 United States has chosen the path of using the MOX fuel

1 which then converts the plutonium into a spent nuclear fuel
2 where it's detectible.

3 So when we're involved with the separation
4 processes -- although the goals have good nonproliferation
5 aspects, some of the steps may not be. So it's very
6 important to analyze all of the processes and the various
7 technologies to make sure we have something that doesn't
8 have a weakness somewhere in the chain and that it's also
9 cost effective.

10 I look forward to reading the draft, when it is
11 available. And I will have more comments at that time.

12 I do agree with the speakers who stress the need to
13 use brownfields where they are available. But I did want to
14 point out the potential problems. Not here, particularly.
15 We have pretty good rainfall in Oak Ridge. But when you're
16 looking at global aspects, not all nations can put reactors
17 where they might want them because they don't all have or
18 aren't all blessed with water resources. And, of course, we
19 have a lot of low-lying land that rises to sea level. We're
20 going to have some real problems

21 And I do believe that nuclear energy is one of the
22 solutions that we should pursue.

23 Thank you.

24 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Miles Smith who will be
25 followed by Elizabeth Dixon.

1 MR. MILES SMITH: Well, like Erich that spoke
2 before me, I'm here for one very important reason and that's
3 for the lovely young lady sitting next to me.

4 The future of Oak Ridge and literally the future of
5 our nation, at least as an economic powerhouse, depends on
6 technology and things like GNEP. I'd also like to echo what
7 Garry Whitley had said earlier. Oak Ridge is blessed with
8 over 30,000 scientists, engineers, technicians, and special
9 craft labor that can make GNEP a reality.

10 I've also got a couple of other reasons why I
11 support GNEP and some of them are a little different, as
12 Wolf had spoke earlier about world opinion and the threat of
13 terrorism. As a veteran of the Iraq war, a recent veteran,
14 I can tell you that I would wholeheartedly support GNEP as a
15 way of reducing our dependency on foreign oil. Perhaps
16 while my experience in Iraq for the most part was good -- I
17 understand our nation's opinion has turned against it -- we
18 probably wouldn't have to be so involved in places as
19 volatile as the Middle East, if we were more energy self-
20 sufficient. GNEP will help get us there and Oak Ridge can
21 bring us GNEP.

22 Not sounding flippant but as a side to that, there
23 is an anecdote to that. I probably lost more men in a
24 squadron in Iraq than will be lost -- than lives will be
25 impacted or lost through GNEP. It is a very safe

1 technology, it's very mature.

2 The waste management technology is one which was a
3 weak point in the past with reprocessing but has caught up
4 with the reprocessing technology. We have vitrification, a
5 proven technology; we have the fast burner reactors, which
6 can burn up the plutonium and eliminate it as a future
7 problem, instead of having the designer repository such as
8 Yucca Mountain for hundreds of thousands of years of usable
9 life to isolate the waste from the environment. Now, if we
10 reprocess, the waste only has to be isolated for 300 to a
11 1,000 years, easily achievable through vitrification
12 technology.

13 And it is an environmental imperative. Whether you
14 believe global warming is a reality or not, we should take
15 steps to be on the safe side and nuclear power is certainly
16 the easiest and most efficient way to generate our energy
17 demand and not produce greenhouse gasses.

18 While I respect Ms. Sarah Smith's opinions on wind
19 and solar, as a practical matter I would not look forward to
20 seeing millions of wind turbine generators outside my window
21 and through out this country and millions of solar rays
22 being a blight on the nature of East Tennessee or the rest
23 of nation. And it is millions of wind generators and solar
24 cells -- solar panels that it takes to replace the power
25 that is generated through nuclear and other fossil fuels.

1 So while I applaud the thoughts that, yes, we would
2 like to have these clean nonwaste producing technologies,
3 they are not a practicality.

4 Finally, again, the economic benefit of GNEP to Oak
5 Ridge and to the nation. We have slipped behind the world
6 as a technology leader. If we are to thrive as a national,
7 we must move forward with our technological leadership; we
8 must receive the technological leadership and move forward
9 so that my children and Erich's children will have a future
10 not only here in Oak Ridge but in the United States.

11 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Our next speaker will be
12 Elizabeth Dixon.

13 MS. ELIZABETH DIXON: I'd like to thank DOE for
14 this opportunity to speak. My name is Elizabeth Dixon and
15 I am on the board of the local Sierra Club. I trust you are
16 familiar with the Sierra Club. It is the largest and oldest
17 environmental organization in the nation and it is also
18 considered the most influential.

19 Speaking only for myself, I want to see the workers
20 of Y-12 and Oak Ridge National Labs to continue to have
21 jobs. I'd like to see our trade and labors continue to have
22 work. But I find this GNEP proposal questionable at best,
23 and here are some of my concerns.

24 These are incredibly expensive, in the billions and
25 billions of dollars, and this money would be better spent to

1 clean-up the already polluted areas and to seek clear and
2 renewable energy sources and encourage energy efficiency.

3 The only facility where this has been tried in the
4 U.S. is the West Valley, New York facility, which is now an
5 environmental disaster with radioactive waste threatening
6 groundwater and the Great Lakes watershed, a 5.2 billion
7 dollar estimate for the clean-up of that site. Some of the
8 sites proposed for this GNEP are already highly polluted and
9 in need of clean-up themselves.

10 I find the whole approach by this administration to
11 wage war to create peace, to proliferate, to prevent
12 proliferation, and the whole of the administration's
13 approach to nuclear matters in general. We threaten war
14 against the countries who are pursuing nuclear and then
15 offer to give nuclear fuel to our friends. But, as we know,
16 our friends of today can become our enemies of tomorrows;
17 for instance, Iraq.

18 I also have concerns about the transportation of
19 these materials, the heavy traffic flow between the Savannah
20 River site and Oak Ridge. That not only offers more
21 opportunities for accidents but also by terrorists.

22 I think that concludes my remarks. I will provide
23 written remarks later.

24 Thank you.

25 MR. BROWN: Thanks very much. The next speaker is

1 Beth Lewis.

2 MS. BETH LEWIS: Thank you very much. You know, I
3 speak with Sarah and I appreciate all of the knowledge here
4 in this room and the fact that you've all been supportive
5 and gotten energy to the United States' citizens, but I feel
6 like it's persistent problems.

7 I don't feel like the problems here are clearly
8 solved with what we're looking at because it hasn't worked
9 out too well. You know, even from what I've read in other
10 countries, like Russia, they tried to breakdown their spent
11 fuel and they had problems with it and had to close the
12 plant down.

13 But the main thing is the expense. Nuclear power
14 has been dependent on government subsidies. Since between
15 1948 and 1998, 111.5 billion has been spent on energy
16 research. 70 billion of that has been going to the nuclear
17 industry, which is, you know, a large portion. 70 billion
18 in 50 years. Over the same 50 years only 12 billion went to
19 renewable energy and 8 billion went to sustainable energy.

20 The whole reason the Clinch River -- it seems
21 things like that in the past have gotten quite out of
22 control, like the Clinch River. The original estimate on
23 that was, you know, something like 400 million. By the time
24 it was up to 8.8 billion it got scrapped.

25 So the Atomic Energy Commission was very, very

1 optimistic in the 70s. It's a great dream. I mean, it
2 sounds good. I wish it was true, you know, but I don't
3 think it is.

4 The history, you know, of how it has developed over
5 these 50 years, doesn't seem to show it as a sustainable
6 resource because the claims were that there would be energy
7 for everybody. It was going to be a wonderful clean energy
8 with a 1,000 nuclear power plants by 2000 as well as
9 reprocessing plants to recycle spent fuel and spent fuel
10 would be the greatest nonproblem in history. But that
11 hasn't happened. We don't have any storage facility. Yucca
12 Mountain, they keep coming up with things that are wrong
13 with it; how it would eventually get into the groundwater.

14 You know, I can't believe 240,000 years. How could
15 we create something that would take -- I can't even imagine
16 a vessel of any type lasting 240,000 years anywhere, you
17 know, without the chance of it being hit by a hurricane or
18 an earthquake or a flood. You know, who's going to be
19 there. It's a terrible thing to leave to our kids, if we
20 even live -- you know, if people survive 240,000 years.
21 Anyway, the problem has not been solved -- that I have ever
22 seen -- with dealing with spent fuel, the plutonium.

23 We already have 103 reactors, no operating
24 breeders, no operating reprocessing facilities, and no high
25 level waste disposal sites. And it isn't safe. When you

1 hear stories -- I'm sure you've all heard stories; stories
2 of people working in the industry. The one story of one
3 young man I know, he went to work at Sea Bright and he was a
4 pretty idealistic guy, a smart guy. He lasted probably less
5 than a year because he said they wouldn't do what -- he was
6 supposed to be the safety inspector -- and they wouldn't do
7 what he said. So he had to leave. And I'm sure you've all
8 heard stories like that. There's so much human fallibility
9 in such a toxic industry.

10 About the wind. I've read that if only 20% of the
11 wind was harnessed, we would have a 100% of energy worldwide
12 that we would need.

13 So I am, you know, against this proposal and I hope
14 we can clean-up what we have and take care of it for the
15 next 240,000 years.

16 Thank you.

17 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Two announcements: One is
18 that concludes the number of folks who had signed up to
19 speak. If anybody else would like to speak at this point,
20 you're welcome to come forward to the microphone.

21 And I'm also to announce that at half-time it's UT
22 40 UK 30.

23 Okay. We have one more speaker. Your name and
24 identification?

25 MR. ROBERT PEELLE: I'm Robert Peelle. I'm a

1 private citizen. I have written remarks as well as a
2 comment.

3 MR. BROWN: That's fine.

4 MR. PEELLE: I want to emphasize one aspect of the
5 remarks. I'm a past everything: a past physicist, a past
6 local government legislator, a past member of various site
7 specific advisory boards and management group in DOE.

8 I applaud the goals of the program that we heard
9 about, GNEP. I can understand the skepticism that's been
10 expressed as well. However, I support the effort to try it,
11 although we can't put all our hopes in nuclear energy
12 because we have to have others.

13 The point that I want to make is that a facility
14 that might be safe to run in one part of the country or in
15 one location may be totally unsafe in another. I say
16 totally unsafe, unacceptable in others. And I'm sure that's
17 true for various facilities in various parts of the country.

18 In Oak Ridge, for instance, we had test trials of
19 fuel reprocessing during the 40s and 50s. We had put away
20 the resulting waste in ways that would no longer be
21 considered. We have been struggling and have spent billions
22 of dollars. DOE has spent billions of dollars to stabilize
23 that waste. The effort is going very well. The main
24 reprocessing waste area in Melton Valley is starting to look
25 like it might hold until the decaying takes place.

1 But in assuming our improvements in waste
2 processing, I believe it will never turn out for a long
3 while that the Oak Ridge Area Reservation is the right place
4 to put this new plant. It's difficult to run such a plant
5 by any process without unexpected leakage, as has been
6 mentioned in the west Valley and some overseas plants.
7 There's been a lot of leakage. So certainly the past parent
8 of the TDEEC office, the Tennessee Department of Energy
9 Environment and Conservation in Oak Ridge, says this place
10 is not a place to release any radioactive material. That
11 would also be true for hazardous waste.

12 The one time when that was tested in the 80s, we
13 considered -- we being a lot of Oak Ridgers -- whether we
14 should have a monitoring retrievable storage of spent fuel
15 from civilian reactors. That was probably a very good
16 project; the biggest failure. I was head of one of the
17 committees of a charged City-County effort to study it.

18 We found there were 25 conditions, or maybe it was
19 22, which had to be met by the program before we thought Oak
20 Ridge/Roane County could accept it. It was a fairly simple
21 thing; it was just a bunch of interim storage facilities.
22 We got about 19 of those accepted by DOE, the Department of
23 Energy. But at that point, Governor Alexander, the current
24 senator, had the project cancelled because he felt it was
25 not suitable for Tennessee.

1 At that time -- those of us who lived here will
2 remember -- we were the bane of Tennessee. A survey of
3 traffic on I-75 said that if that -- truck drivers and
4 people -- said that if that monitored refueable storage site
5 were put in Oak Ridge, they wouldn't use I-75 anymore. That
6 was pretty ridiculous. But it was the way that we were
7 reviewed.

8 And the biggest community and the rest of us in
9 Tennessee and Oak Ridge were thought that perception, that
10 this is a place of dirt, for many years. It's getting
11 better, probably because of the environmental management
12 efforts.

13 But I predict that if we should accept the fuel
14 reprocessing plant, even if it's perfect, which seems almost
15 incredible, it will give us a bad name again. It will hurt
16 us.

17 The reactor for growing uranium and transuranics --
18 since we did the site of the Clinch River Reactor, a
19 neighboring spot in 1965 or some such time, one could assume
20 that that might be sited for the Reservation, unlike the
21 fuel reprocessing. However --

22 MR. BROWN: You're at the five-minute level.

23 MR. PEELLE: -- Knoxville has moved in our
24 direction. It might not be plausible now.

25 So I hope the project goes forward, but I think not

1 in Oak Ridge.

2 MR. BROWN: Is there anybody -- yes, we have
3 another person to speak.

4 MR. FRANZ RAETZER: My name is Franz Raetzer. I
5 live over in Harriman. This all sounds really nice and
6 good. But if you look at the past experience -- and if the
7 indication of the sound system that was chosen for this
8 meeting is as imperfect as that, what we do know is that we
9 deal with people that don't know how to handle anything for
10 it.

11 They have all these posters up there. They don't
12 say anything about how this reactor should work except that
13 it's just a Molten Salt Reactor. How good is that?

14 We have in the past have had poisoned the workers
15 with the beryllium. We have two million pounds of mercury
16 in Watts Bar Lake and the river. We have -- just recently
17 they fined one of the corporations where the management of
18 it let about, I think, 400 thousand gallons of radioactive
19 water into the creek instead of the holding pond to treat
20 it.

21 So I think what this PEIS should do is really tell
22 us first, before we can make any comment, what this is all
23 about. What do you really know now about these processes?
24 And then we hear, "We are not the experts."

25 So how can we make a decision here or a proposal on

1 how it should be done.

2 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Anyone else?

3 All right. We are scheduled to stay until 9:30.

4 Customarily, what we do in this case is we will recess at
5 this point.

6 If people want to ask more questions about the
7 materials, that's fine; and if anybody in the course of the
8 next hour should decide to offer another comment, please see
9 me and we will reconvene.

10 Thank you for your attention.

11 (A break was taken at which time the following private
12 comments were taken by the court reporter.)

13 PRIVATE COMMENTS

14 MR. GERRY MOLL: Briefly. My name is Gerry Moll
15 and I am a local resident and would like to express my
16 opposition to moving this reprocessing plant forward. I
17 really feel there are environmental concerns, safety
18 concerns, and terrorism concerns. The whole idea is a
19 concern.

20 It seems to me that this is proliferating when we
21 are trying to stress nonproliferation around the world. We
22 need to be cutting back and getting rid of this really
23 dangerous industry and finding other ways to supply our
24 energy needs, not increasing it.

25 Also, I have to say I think it's a really dangerous

1 thought to think that we -- it seems this program wants to
2 control the plutonium. I don't know that the rest of the
3 world is willing to trust us in that role at this point. So
4 that's another large concern of mine about the program.

5 Another thing I would say and I will put this all
6 in a written comment as well. If one really looks at the
7 history of the nuclear industry and looks at it worldwide
8 and in this country, I think one would have to admit that
9 moving forward with a program of this kind is highly
10 questionable. We just haven't proven ourselves to be very
11 reliable in handling nuclear wastes.

12 Thank you very much.

13 ROBERT G. KENNEDY, PE: My name is Robert G.
14 Kennedy, PE. I'm a Past President for Friends of ORNL and
15 President of ULTIMAX Group, Inc. and President of O'Ryan,
16 Inc. So that's two nonprofits and a corporation. I have a
17 background in nuclear engineering, robotics, and mechanical
18 engineering.

19 I think the Actinide Burning Reactor is a great
20 idea. I believe Oak Ridge is the natural best place in the
21 country to build such a reactor, to research and to build
22 it.

23 I think Oak Ridge is the naturally worst place in
24 the country to put a fuel reprocessing plant because of the
25 geology and the hydrology and the climate, and also because

1 the population is beginning to grow up to the Reservation.

2 So that's it. Short and sweet.

3 (The meeting was reconvened.)

4 Mr. Brown: This is Holmes Brown, the facilitator
5 for this evening's meeting at Oak Ridge. I am reconvening
6 the meeting and am asking: Are there any other members of
7 the public that would like make a comment at this time?

8 Since there is no other person who wishes to make a
9 comment, this concludes this session of the scoping meetings
10 on the GNEP PEIS. Thank you for your participation and
11 comments.

12 Also, please note that you may continue to submit
13 comments on the scope of the PEIS until the comment period
14 closes on April 4. Check your packet for information
15 regarding how and where to submit these comments.

16 I will now adjourn this meeting.

17 Thank you very much.

18 (The meeting was adjourned.)

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 C E R T I F I C A T E

2 STATE OF TENNESSEE)

3 COUNTY OF KNOX)

4 I, JIMMIE JANE McCONNELL, CLA, CCR(TN), Court
5 Reporter and Notary Public in and for the County of Knox,
6 State of Tennessee at Large, do hereby certify:

7 That I reported stenographically the Public Scoping
8 Meeting on the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement
9 Global Nuclear Energy Partnership held in Oak Ridge,
10 Tennessee, on the 13th day of February, 2007; that the said
11 comments in connection with the public meeting were reduced
12 to typewritten form by me; that the foregoing transcript is
13 a true and accurate record of said comments to the best of
14 my knowledge, skills, and ability.

15 I further certify that I am not kin to any of the
16 parties, and I have no financial or otherwise interest in
17 the action if these proceedings whatsoever.

18 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and
19 affixed my Notarial Seal this 23rd day of February, 2007.

20 _____
21 Notary Public

22 My Commission Expires: 06/07/08.

23

24

25